REMARKS

Initially, applicants would like to express their appreciation to Examiner Tilahun Gesesse for the courtesies extended to attorney James Milton during a telephone conversation on April 28, 2006. The telephone conversation involved a discussion of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §102(a). During the interview, Examiner Gesesse agreed with attorney Milton that the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection could be overcome since applicants' specification discloses notifications not taught by Henrikson reference. Also, attorney Milton agreed to clarify the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

As known by those of ordinary skill in the art, the term "one or more" means "at least". Applicants have amended claims 1-4, 7, 12-15 and 17-20 by changing the term "one or more" to the term "at least one" where needed to clarify the meaning of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since claim 2-12 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Independent claims 13 and 19 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, claims 13 and 19 are likewise allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since claims 14-18 depend from claim 13, and

claim 20 depends from claim 19, these dependent claims are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0053612 issued to Henrikson et al. dated March 20, 2003.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Henrikson does not teach applicants' independent claim 1 limitation, as amended, that now recites,

> "an application server component that receives one or more notifications of at least one open communication session from one or more first communication devices, wherein the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers, email, a text message, an audio message, a video message, and an interactive multimedia session."

Applicants agree that Henrikson discloses a technique for providing a conference call for numerous individuals. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Henrikson does not teach that the one or more notifications are not limited to email, a text message, an audio message, a video message, and an interactive multimedia session. Instead, Henrikson teaches that each participant may receive a notification via email, a text message, an audio message, a video message, and an interactive multimedia session, as stated in paragraph 0033.

Thus, the clear teaching of Henrikson is that the one or more notifications are limited to email, a text message, an audio message, a video message, and an interactive multimedia session.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that Henrikson does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Henrikson. Since claims 2-12 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Henrikson.

Independent claims 13 and 19 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Henrikson. For example, claim 13 recites, "sending one or more notifications of at least one open communication session to one or more communication devices, wherein the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers, email, a text message, an audio message, a video message, and an interactive multimedia session", and claim 19 recites, "means in the one or more media for sending one or more notifications of at least one open communication session to one or more communication devices, wherein the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers, email, a text message, an audio message, a video message, and an interactive multimedia session". Henrikson does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 13 and 19 are likewise allowable over Henrikson. Since claims 14-18 depend from claim 13 and claim 20 depends from claim 19, these dependent claims are also allowable over Henrikson.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: May 24, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382